

REMARKS

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first
5 paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description
requirement. More specifically, it is alleged that there is no
support given from the original disclosure for the limitation
"without the use of a broker" or "brokerless" in claims 1, 9 and
12.

10 On page 5, lines 20-23, it is stated as follows:

"The invention is designed to allow Java applications to
talk to .Net Remoting objects without any .Net components
running on the Java platform and will be referred to as
15 Ja.Net (Java-.Net Communication)."

The above passage appears again on page 7, lines 3-7.

"The first type of implementation of Ja.Net is one that
allows Java objects to talk to .Net Remoting objects. In
20 other words, a Java client is enabled to understand .Net
Remoting protocols. Any supported transport protocol and
data format supported by .Net Remoting can be used."

On page 3, lines 11-16 the following is stated:

"This method of bridging allows Java clients to use the
.Net Remoting protocol to interact with a Web Service
running in the .Net Framework. This method also allows
.Net Framework clients to communicate with Java-based
30 applications using the .Net Remoting protocol."

Clearly, the above passages describe a system, which does not
require an intermediary or broker. The interaction by Java
clients with a Web Service running in the .Net Framework is
35 direct and requires no broker. Similarly, the interaction
between .Net Framework clients with Java-based applications is
also direct. Accordingly, the above-mentioned passages support

the language of inter-object communication "without the use of a broker" as in claim 1 or a "brokerless" system as in claim 9.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

5 Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (IBM TDB), "Brokerless Object Network", No. NN960561.

10 In applying claim 1 to Thomas, it is stated that Thomas discloses a method for allowing objects in a first programming language to communicate with objects in a second programming language. To support this assertion the Examiner points to p. 1, paragraph [0011], lines 30-33 of Thomas, which says the
15 following:

20 "the client (*using a first programming language*) downloads the requested communication proxy and dynamically interacts, at runtime, with an Internet service (*using a second programming language*) using the requested communication proxy, the communication proxy being local to the client"

The words in parenthesis are those of the Examiner. In Thomas,
25 the client downloads the communication proxy from the Service. The client then interacts directly with the local communication proxy it has downloaded and the latter communicates directly with the Service on behalf of the Client using any protocol that the Service may provide such as CLR, Java, COM, etc.

30 In Applicant's invention, the Server sends metadata to the client who generates proxies from the metadata, which are then implemented on the client. By generating its own proxies, Applicant can optimize and verify its applications in

development. It can also specify a protocol and a programming language.

While both Thomas and Applicant receive metadata information,
5 the metadata information of Thomas is sent by a broker to enable
the client to locate the matched Internet Service communication
proxy. The metadata in the present invention is received from a
Java Server on a .Net Remoting client and used to generate .Net
proxies. The .Net proxies are implemented on the .Net client.

10 The IBM reference simply describes the operation of a Token Ring
System of Communication among a number of objects. It describes
how a second object of unknown location is located by a first
object by passing a token around from node to node of a network
15 until the token is loaded successfully, stripped from the ring
and the message responded to. This enables the two objects to
communicate.

20 The present application is concerned primarily with a system of
communication between Java objects and .Net Remoting objects not
just in one object locating another object so that communication
can take place. Consequently, Thomas combined with IBM TDB does
not render obvious any of independent claims 1, 9 or 12.

25 As stated in the previous amendment, claims 1, 9 and 12 all
recite direct one-to-one mapping of .Net classes and Java
classes. The mapping between classes is determined in advance,
at compile time. Such mapping of classes is not discussed or
suggested by Thomas, IBM TDB or Zhang. To Applicant's knowledge
30 such one-to-one mapping has not been done before.

The one-to-one class matching of the present invention allows one to talk to a .Net Remoting object from Java without any .Net component running on the machine.


5 In paragraph 2 of page 13 of the Official Action, the Examiner in interpreting the statement in paragraph [0011], last sentence, states that it clearly indicates that in other embodiments it is advantageous for the client to actually generate the remote communications code. However, an indication
10 that the client is relieved from having to develop a remote communication code does not say that in other embodiments the client must generate such a code. In fact, Thomas, in paragraph [0003], lines 7-13, emphasizes the advantage over the prior art of the client being able to specify a protocol and a
15 language/component technology that makes the most sense for the client. In paragraph [0019] the last sentence does refer to an embodiment in which the Client 100 receives service description language information from Broker 102 and develops an application, its own communication code, to communicate with
20 Service 104. However, the latter embodiment still depends on receiving information from a broker and does not mention one-to-one mapping.

In paragraph 4 of page 14 of the Official Action, the statement
25 "the matched Internet service communication proxy," does not refer to one-to-one matching (or mapping) of classes from the second programming language to the first programming language. The foregoing statement merely refers to locating an Internet service which matches the request of the Client. Half-way down
30 paragraph [0011] the full sentence in which the foregoing words appear is as follows: "The broker matches the client request

and an Internet service, and transmits metadata to the client enabling the client to locate the matched Internet service communication proxy. Clearly, the word "matched" relates to the earlier word "matches" and has been taken out of context.

5 Applicant respectfully solicits re-consideration of the claims of the present application which he submits are in condition for allowance.

10 Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2006 By: 
15 Matthew A. Pequignot
Reg. No. 43,851
Attorney for Applicant

20 Hall, Vande Sande & Pequignot, LLP
10220 River Road, Suite 200
Potomac, Maryland
USA 20854
Tel: (301) 983 - 2500
Fax: (301) 983 - 2100

25